



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/042,731	12/21/2000	John Bullock	IQN0001	8862
25235	7590	02/21/2006	EXAMINER	
HOGAN & HARTSON LLP ONE TABOR CENTER, SUITE 1500 1200 SEVENTEENTH ST DENVER, CO 80202				DESHHPANDE, KALYAN K
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
				3623

DATE MAILED: 02/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/042,731	BULLOCK ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Kalyan K. Deshpande	3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 December 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 10,11,14,16 and 24 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-9,12,13,15,17-23 and 25-32 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Introduction***

1. The following is a final office action in response to the communications received on December 6, 2005. Claims 1-2, 12, 15, 21, 23, and 25 have been amended. Claims 10-11, 14, 16, and 24 have been cancelled. Claims 29-32 are new claims. Claims 1-32 are now pending in this application.

### ***Response to Amendment***

2. Applicant's amendments to the specification are acknowledged. Applicant's amendments to claims 1-2, 12, 15, 21, 23, and 25 are acknowledged. Applicant's new claims 29-32 are acknowledged.

Per Applicant's amendments to the specification, Examiner withdraws the objections to the specification.

Per Applicant's amendments to claims 21 and 23-27, Examiner withdraws the 35 U.S.C 101 rejections.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed December 6, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not found persuasive. Applicant argues Kurzius et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6385620) and Joao (U.S. Patent No. 6662194) do not teach: i) profiles with restricted portions and using restricted portions for matching, ii) degrees of compatibility to score a match from the employers' side and job applicants' side iii) background information including fields or input boxes for entering an indication of which job skills or attributes the job applicant wants to use at future jobs, and iv) continuously comparing profiles to identify matches.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 23, 30, and 31 regarding degrees of compatibility to score a match from the employers' side and job applicants' side have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejections, as new matter has been asserted, per Applicant's remarks.

In response to Applicant's argument Kurzius et al. and Joao fail to teach profiles with restricted portions and using restricted portions for matching, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Joao teaches restricted data for use by the external matching engine in obtaining a match for the data record (Joao: col. 14, line 61 to col. 15, line 10, and col. 23, lines 35-52). Joao teaches the use of generic terms to conceal and/or suggest attributes rather than using actual values. By using generic terms, the user is restricting hiring agents from obtaining the actual terms without the user's consent. Upon a showing of interest by a hiring agent, the user can avail the specific details. Use of generic data serves the same functionality as restricting data in that both do not disclose data the user does not wish to disclose. Additionally, the matching is done based on the information the user provides. User has the ability to set forth similar data for matching such that the matching is not affected. The example provided by Joao describes a user entering "Ivy League School" rather than entering a specific Ivy League school. This information is true information and affects the matching engine the same. The advantage restricting data from other users is that it allows for a user to not have to disclose sensitive data. It would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine

the feature of using generic data to the Kurzius et al. system in order to allow users to maintain a level of confidentiality, which is a goal of Joao (Joao: col. 2 line 62 to col. 3 line 8).

In response to Applicant's argument that Kurzius et al. does not teach background information including fields or input boxes for entering an indication of which job skills or attributes the job applicant wants to use at future jobs, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Kurzius et al. teaches attributes set for matching include location information, educational information, employment information, skills information and previous salary information. (Kurzius et al.: col. 7 lines 8-25 and figures 14a, 14b and 15). All of these fields are used by the matching engine for matching purposes. The user is enabled to enter skills he wishes to market and emphasize to the matching engine by entering a degree of proficiency. Furthermore, the Kurzius et al. system provides a field for a user to enter in future career goals which includes which job skills or attributes the job applicant wants to use at future jobs.

In response to Applicant's argument that Kurzius et al. and Joao do not teach continuously comparing profiles to identify matches, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant argues that the cited portions are "merely objects of the Summary" of the system. Additional citations teaching this limitation outside of the summary of the patent are provided below. Furthermore, Joao teaches continuous comparing profiles to identify matches (Joao col. 5, line 65 to col..6, line 9, col.9, lines 11-15, col. 28 lines 31-41, col. 30 lines 1-12, and column 39 lines 23-25). Applicant argues "a continuous process does not need

activation". The Joao system describes the system as self-activating and/or can be activated automatically. Joao is describing a typical workflow system, where the workflow of the system is a continuous process and triggers or events (such as data entry of new profiles) cause different engines, such as the matching engine, to evaluate the new data. The matching engine is continuously operating and evaluates data based on the system triggers.

Examiner has fully considered Applicant's arguments and maintains the rejection of claims 1-9,12,13,15,17-23 and 25-32.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-9, 12-13, 15, 17-23, and 25-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurzius et al (U.S. Patent No. 6385620) in further view of Joao (U.S. Patent No. 6662194) and Shapiro et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6915269).

As per claim 1, Kurzius et al. teaches:

A system for matching entities having needs to entities having capability to meet the needs, the system comprising:

A plurality of needs profiles, wherein each need profile comprises a data record specifying attributes about a need (col. 7, lines 8-25, Kurzius et al.

teach the job posting database is composed of a plurality of job posting records that are generated from job posting submissions received from the web server. The job posting review template is a template including fields used to display job criteria for a particular job posting record that is accessed for review.);

A plurality of capability profiles, wherein each capability profile comprises a data record specifying a set of attributes of an entity having a capability of meeting a need (col. 5, lines 49-67, Kurzius et al. teach that in operation of the system, the web server receives candidate qualification data in the form of a candidate profile from a job candidate.); and

A matching engine coupled to repetitively and automatically examine the needs profiles and capability profiles to identify matched profiles and for each pair of matched profiles to determine a pair of scores indicating a compatibility of a particular match to each of the matched profiles, wherein a match comprises a set of profiles judged to be substantially compatible based upon correspondence of the attributes specified therein (col. 8, lines 28-40, Kurzius et al. teach a candidate matching engine operable to match candidate records to job posting records. The candidate matching engine includes matching algorithms and/or hierarchies of matching criteria wherein different weights can be assigned to different criteria depending on empirical data, employer, and/or recruiter preference.).

Kurzius et al. fail to teach:

the process is performed repetitively and automatically.

determining a pair of scores indicating a compatibility of a particular match to each of the matched profiles.

Joao teaches providing job searching services, recruitment services and/or recruitment-related services, which can be programmed to be self-activating and/or be activated automatically and operation may be triggered by any type of pre-specified event and/or occurrence, which may include a new individual listing, a new employer and/or hiring entity listing (Joao col. 5, line 65 to col. 6, line 9, col. 9, lines 11-15, col. 28 lines 31-41, col. 30 lines 1-12, and column 39 lines 23-25). The advantages of repetitively and automatically performing the process of matching is that it reduces the time, expense, effort, and potential human error incurred by manually performing the task. It would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the repetitive and automatic feature of Joao's system to the Kurzius et al. system, both systems being recruiting systems, in order to reduce the time, expense, effort and potential human error incurred by performing the process manually, which is a goal of Joao (Joao col. 40 line 66 to col. 41 line 3). Furthermore, it has been held that the automation of a manual process is within the ordinary skill of the art. *In re Venner*, 120 USPQ 192, 194; 262 F2d 91 (CCPA 1958).

Shapiro et al. teaches determining a pair of scores indicating the compatibility of a particular match to each of the matched profiles (Shapiro col. 13 line 66 to col. 14 line 63, col. 16 line 57 to col. 17 line 25, col. 18 lines 24-63, and col. 21 lines 45-67). The advantage of determining a pair of scores, as

opposed to a unilateral matching, is that both parties' requirements are satisfied resulting in a better and more successful match. It would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, to combine the bilateral evaluation (pair of scores) of matching feature from the Shapiro et al. system to the Kurzius et al. system, both systems having the capabilities to find best matches for profiles, in order to satisfy both parties' requirements and to generate better matches, which is a goal of Shapiro et al. (Shapiro col. 1 lines 31-41 and col. 7 lines 38-44)

As per claim 2, Shapiro et al. teaches a notification message generated to first and second users associated with each profile in a particular one of the pairs of matched profiles, where in the notification message comprises the match score associated with the particular one of the profiles with the two match scores being determined based on differing sets of matched attributes that are weighted independently by the first and second users (Shapiro col. 13 line 66 to col. 14 line 63, col. 16 line 57 to col. 17 line 25, col. 18 lines 24-63, and col. 21 lines 45-67; where first and second users enter profile data. First users enter preference data. Second users enter preference data. The system analyzes the data and scores best matches based on first users' preference data. The system then analyzes the data and scores best matches based on second users' preference data. The system generates a list of the scored matches and communicates the list to the users.). The advantages of scoring the matches based on first and second users' data and notifying the users of the best scored matches list are that both parties' requirements are satisfied resulting in more successful matches and the notification to the parties allows them to identify persons best suited to

Art Unit: 3623

fulfill requirements. It would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, for one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the matching based on both the first and second users' preferences and the notification of the best matches list to the users feature to the Kurzius et al. system in order to gain the advantages of satisfying both parties' requirements resulting in more successful matches and identifying persons best suited to fulfill a party's requirements, which are goals of Shapiro et al. (Shapiro col. 1 lines 31-41 and col. 7 lines 38-44).

As per claim 3, Shapiro et al. teaches the notification message includes a selected subset of attributes from the matched profile(s) (Shapiro col. 21 lines 45-67; where the system communicates to the users a ranked list of best matches. Included in this notification are the users' attributes and whatever information the users have authorized to send to each other). The advantage of including a selected subset of attributes is that the recipient is can easily identify the persons and persons' attributes that satisfy the recipient's requirements and thus reduce wasted time. It would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the feature of including a selected subset of attributes of the matched profiles in the notification to the user to the Kurzius et al. System in order to allow the recipient to easily identify the persons and persons' attributes that satisfy the recipients requirements and thus reduce wasted time, which is a goal of Kurzius et al. (Kurzius col. 2 lines 25-50).

As per claim 4, Kurzius et al. teaches:

The system of claim 3 further comprising:

A response message generated by a recipient of a notification message (Kurzius et al. col. 4 lines 5-40; where a response to receiving notification can be done in many ways, including email.); and

A detailed notification message generated to the users associated with the matched profiles in response to receiving response messages from both users associated with a particular matched profile (Kurzius et al. col. 4 lines 5-40; where users have the ability to communicate and send notifications to each other. An employer may indicate interest in a candidate profile and transmit such interest for receipt by the web engine, indicating on the candidate's profile of detailed employer notification.).

As per claim 5, Kurzius et al. teach:

The system of claim 1 wherein the each need profile specifies attributes that described a human resources need and each capability profile comprises attribute that describe skills of a job candidate (Kurzius et al.: col. 6, lines 27-29 and col. 7, lines 23-25, Kurzius et al. teach the job posting review template used to display job criteria for a particular job posting record that is accessed for review. Candidate qualification data entered by a potential candidate is organized and stored in a candidate record.).

As per claim 6, Kurzius et al. teach:

The system of claim 5 wherein the job candidate attributes include attributes describing the associated candidate's qualifications (Kurzius et al.: col. 5, lines 49-51, Kurzius et al. teach the web server receives candidate qualification data in the form of a candidate profile from a job candidate.).

As per claim 7, Kurzius et al. teach:

The system of claim 5 wherein the job candidate attributes describe the associated candidate's desire to use particular skills in future employment (Kurzius et al.: col. 16, lines 50-57, Kurzius et al. teach candidates can indicate career goals, desired benefits and other comments directed toward the candidate's background or toward the candidate's desired employment opportunity.).

As per claim 8, Kurzius et al. teach:

The system of claim 1 wherein the needs profile data record is persistent (Kurzius et al.: col. 7, lines 8-25, Kurzius et al. teach a job posting submission generated by an employer using a web server is organized and stored in a particular job posting record.).

As per claim 9, Kurzius et al. teach:

The system of claim 1 wherein the capability profile data record is persistent (Kurzius et al.: col. 5, lines 49-67, Kurzius et al. teach the candidate qualification data is communicated to the database server for processing, indexing and storage.).

As per claim 12, Kurzius et al. teach:

A job applicant agent comprising:

A user interface for gathering information from a job applicant (Kurzius et al.: col. 3, lines 66-67 and col. 4, line 63 to col. 5, line 2, Kurzius et al. teach the system includes a web server in communication with a candidate client. Candidate client include a web browser.);

A data record generated from the gathered information, the data record comprising a plurality of attributes describing skills of an associated job applicant, the data record being formatted for use in and continuously accessible by an external matching engine, wherein the data record further comprises attribute describing the associated job applicant's desire to utilize specified skills in future job assignments (Kurzius et al.: col. 5 lines 49-67, col. 8 lines 28-40, col. 16 lines 11-15, col. 16, lines 50-57, and figures 14a and 14b; where candidate qualification data is communicated to the database server for processing, indexing and storage. A candidate matching engine operable to match candidate records to job posting records includes matching algorithms and/or hierarchies of matching criteria wherein different weights can be assigned to different criteria depending on empirical data, employer, and/or recruiter preference. Kurzius et al. also teach candidates can indicate career goals, desired benefits and other comments directed toward the candidate's background or toward the candidate's desired employment opportunity. This data is associated with the user's profile and continuously used by the matching engine as candidate qualification data. Figure 14b allows the user to select skills that will be used by the matching engine to determine matching profiles. In other words, these are the skills the user desires to search for an occupation on. Figure 14a further allows a user to enter in career goals.); and

A network interface configured to communicate the data record to the external matching engine (Kurzius et al.: col. 4, lines 49-62 and col. 5, lines

25-37, Kurzius et al. teach a web server and database server can be separate servers communicating across a particular communications link.

The system may be part of a local area network (LAN), a wide-area network (WAN) or other suitable network or interconnection of computing devices.).

As per claim 13, Kurzius et al. teaches:

The applicant agent of claim 12 wherein the data record is formatted to enable the eternal matching engine to readily detect matches between the described skills and required skills of a hiring agent data record accessible by the matching engine (Kurzius et al.: col. 8, lines 28-40 and col. 10, lines 6-13, Kurzius et al. teach the candidate matching engine is a software module or other suitable combination of software and/or hardware components operable to match candidate records to job posting records. The candidate qualification data is received from the candidate as entered or selected in the candidate survey form. For, example, after a candidate has completely filled out a candidate survey form with both freeform data and data selected by the candidate from pregenerated data items, a candidate may select to submit the survey form. The Examiner interprets the pregenerated data items to suggest a format for the data that is used by the matching engine.).

As per claim 15, Kurzius et al. teaches:

An automated hiring agent comprising:

A user interface for gathering information from a human hiring agent (Kurzius et al.: col. 3, line 66 to col. 4, line 1 and col. 4, line 63 to col. 5, line 2, Kurzius et al. teach the system includes a web server in communication

with a recruiter client and an employer client. Recruiter client and an employer client include a web browser.);

A data record generated from the gathered information, the data record comprising a plurality of attributes describing skills required by an associated job, the data record being formatted for use in and continuously accessible by an external matching engine, wherein the data record comprises a public data accessible by users accessing the external matching engine and for sharing with the users accessing the eternal matching engine based on predefined rules (Kurzius et al.: col. 7, lines 23-25, Kurzius et al. teach the job posting review template is a template including fields used to display job criteria for a particular job posting record that is accessed for review.); and

A network interface configured to communicate the data record to the external matching engine (Kurzius et al.: col. 4, lines 49-62 and col. 5, lines 25-37, Kurzius et al. teach a web server and database server can be separate servers communicating across a particular communications link. The system may be part of a local area network (LAN), a wide-area network (WAN) or other suitable network or interconnection of computing devices.).

Kurzius fails to teach restricted data for use by the external matching engine in obtaining a match for the data record. Joao teaches restricted data for use by the external matching engine in obtaining a match for the data record (Joao: col. 14, line 61 to col. 15, line 10, and col. 23, lines 35-52). Joao teaches the use of generic terms to conceal and/or suggest attributes rather than using actual values. By using generic terms, the user is restricting

hiring agents from obtaining the actual terms without the user's consent. Upon a showing of interest by a hiring agent, the user can avail the specific details. Use of generic data serves the same functionality as restricting data in that both do not disclose data the user does not wish to disclose. Additionally, the matching is done based on the information the user provides. User has the ability to set forth similar data for matching such that the matching is not affected. The example provided by Joao describes a user entering "Ivy League School" rather than entering a specific Ivy League school. This information is true information and affects the matching engine the same. The advantage restricting data from other users is that it allows for a user to not have to disclose sensitive data. It would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the feature of using generic data to the Kurzius et al. system in order to allow users to maintain a level of confidentiality, which is a goal of Joao (Joao: col. 2 line 62 to col. 3 line 8).

As per claim 17, Kurzius et al. teach:

The hiring agent of claim 15 further comprising a template data record, the template data record comprising predefined attributes describing the skills required by the associated job, wherein the user interface is populated with information from the template data record before gathering information from the human hiring agent (Kurzius et al.: col. 7, lines 23-47 and col. 14, lines 55-67, Kurzius et al. teach that as with candidate review templates, different versions of job posting templates may exist and be displayed depending on the identity of the user accessing a job posting record for review. A job

posting form is presented to the employer for entry of job description. The job posting form includes desired candidate qualifications in the form of job criteria.).

As per claim 18, Kurzius et al. teach:

A matching engine for matching attributes specified by a plurality of hiring agents with attributes specified by a plurality of job applicant agents, the matching engine comprising:

A database storing a plurality of hiring agents and a plurality of job applicant agents (col. 5, lines 49-67 and col. 7, lines 8-25, Kurzius et al. teach the job posting database is composed of a plurality of job posting records that are generated from job posting submissions received from the web server. The job posting review template is a template including fields used to display job criteria for a particular job posting record that is accessed for review. Kurzius et al. also teach that in operation of the system, the web server receives candidate qualification data in the form of a candidate profile from a job candidate.);

Kurzius et al. fail to teach:

A mechanism for continuously comparing profiles in the database to identify matches between hiring agents and job applicant agents.

Claim 18 recites limitations already addressed by the rejection of claim 1; therefore the same rejection applies to this claim.

As per claim 19, Kurzius fails to teach:

a notification mechanism response to identification of a match for notifying users associated with agents associated with a match.

Claim 19 recites limitations already addressed by the rejection of claim 2; there for the same rejection applies to this claim.

As per claim 20, Kurzius et al. teach:

The matching engine of claim 18 further comprising:

An interface receiving job applicant agent profiles (Kurzius et al.: col. 3, lines 66-67 and col. 4, line 63 to col. 5, line 2, Kurzius et al. teach the system includes a web server in communication with a candidate client. Candidate client include a web browser.);

An interface receiving hiring agent profiles (Kurzius et al.: col. 3, line 66 to col. 4, line 1 and col. 4, line 63 to col. 5, line 2, Kurzius et al. teach the system includes a web server in communication with a recruiter client and an employer client. Recruiter client and an employer client include a web browser.);

Kurzius et al. fail to teach:

Wherein the mechanism for continuously comparing profiles is invoked in response to receiving a new profile.

Claim 20 recites the same limitation for continuously comparing profiles invoked in response to receiving a new profile as addressed by the rejection of claim 1; there for the same rejection applies here.

As per claim 21, Kurzius et al. teach:

A computer implemented method for incrementally revealing information in a profile matching system comprising:

Providing a plurality of profiles in memory of a computing device, each profile associated with a user and each profile comprising a set of attributes describing the associated user (Kurzus et al.: col. 7, lines 8-25, Kurzus et al. teach the job posting database is composed of a plurality of job posting records that are generated from job posting submissions received from the web server. The job posting review template is a template including fields used to display job criteria for a particular job posting record that is accessed for review.);

Kurzus et al. fail to teach:

At least one restricted information section within a profile such that the profile can be accessed by the users accessing the computing device while the restricted information section remains protected from the accessing users;

Automatically matching profiles based on correspondence of attributes specified in the profiles, including attributes within the restricted section;

With the computing device presenting automatically matched profiles to the users associated with the profile in a manner that prevents exposing the restricted information section;

Enabling each user that is presented with a matched profile to indicate further interest; and

Responsive to receiving indication of the further interest from all the users associated with a matched profile, presenting with the computing device

detailed information including information in the restricted information section of a matched profile.

Claim 21 recites limitations already addressed by the rejection of claims 1 and 15; therefore the same rejections apply to this claim.

As per claim 22, Kurzius et al. teach:

A state machine for use in a human resources matching engine, the state machine comprising:

An unmatched state (Kurzius et al.: col. 5, lines 49-67 and col. 8, lines 28-31, Kurzius et al. teach a web server receives candidate qualifications data in the form of a candidate profile. The candidate qualification data may be communicated to a database server for processing, indexing and storage using the candidate mapping engine. The web server also receives job posting submissions from an employer via an employer client using the employer web engine. Job posting submissions may also be communicated to a database server for processing, indexing and storage using an employer indexing engine. Candidate matching engine is a software module operable to match candidate records to job posting records. The Kurzius et al. system is in an unmatched state prior to activating the matching engine.);

An automatched state reached from the unmatched state upon detection of a substantial correspondence between first stored profile and a second stored profile (col. 8, lines 28-40, Kurzius et al. teach a candidate matching engine operable to match candidate records to job posting records. The candidate matching engine includes matching algorithms and/or hierarchies

of matching criteria wherein different weights can be assigned to different criteria depending on empirical data, employer, and/or recruiter preference.);

Joao teaches (where Kurzus et al. fail to teach):

A first interested state reached from the automatched state upon indication that a user associated with the first stored profile is interested in pursuing a relationship with a user associated with the second stored profile (Joao: col. 23, lines 35-52, Joao teaches if it is determined that the employer is interested in pursuing discussion with the individual, then the central processing computer will notify the individual by transmitting a message to the individual, and/or individual computer associated with the individual, so notifying the individual. The individual can review the data and/or information and transmit a response to the central processing computer. The central processing computer will process the individual's response and determine if the individual is interesting in pursuing discussions with the employer.);

A second interested state reached from the automatched state upon indication that a user associated with the second stored profile is interested in pursuing a relationship with a user associated with the second stored profile (Joao: col. 23, lines 35-52, Joao teaches if it is determined that the employer is interested in pursuing discussion with the individual, then the central processing computer will notify the individual by transmitting a message to the individual, and/or individual computer associated with the individual, so notifying the individual. The individual can review the data and/or information and transmit a response to the central processing computer. The central

processing computer will process the individual's response and determine if the individual is interesting in pursuing discussions with the employer.);

A not interested state reached from the automatched state upon indication that either the user associated with the first stored profile or the user associated with the second stored profile is not interested in pursuing a relationship with the other user (Joao: col. 22, lines 54-67, Joao teaches the central processing computer will determine whether the individual wants to apply for any of the reported jobs. If it is determined that the individual does not want to apply for any of the reported jobs, the central processing computer will record and/or store any and/or all data and/or information regarding and/or pertinent to the search and/or corresponding results, up to this point, including the actions of the individual.); and

An evaluating state reached from the first interested state upon indication that a user associated with the second stored profile is interest in pursuing a relationship with a user associated with the first stored profile or upon indication that a user associated with the first stored profile is interested in pursuing a relationship with a user associated with the second stored profile (Joao: col. 24, lines 22-49, Joao teaches that if it is determined that the employer is interesting in pursuing the opportunity with the individual, the central processing computer will put the employer and the individual in contact with each other by transmitting contact information to either or both of the employer and/or the individual. The central processing computer can monitor the interview, employment screening, and/or recruitment

processes, which takes place between the employer and the individual.

The examiner interprets an evaluation state is reached when both users are in contact with each other and an interview takes place.).

The advantage of these features taught by Joao is that communication between matched users is facilitated. It would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, to combine these features taught by Joao to the Kurzius et al. system in order to facilitate communication between matched users, which is a goal of Joao (Joao: col. 8 lines 22-48).

As per claim 23, Kurzius et al.

A method implemented by processes running on a human resources server for matching job applicants with hiring agents, the method comprising the acts of:

Generating a plurality of needs profiles, wherein each needs profile comprises attributes about a need associated with a particular hiring agent (col. 7, lines 8-25, Kurzius et al. teach the job posting database is composed of a plurality of job posting records that are generated from job posting submissions received from the web server. The job posting review template is a template including fields used to display job criteria for a particular job posting record that is accessed for review.);

Storing the needs profiles as a data record in memory accessible by the human resources server (col. 7, lines 8-25, Kurzius et al. teach a job posting submission generated by an employer using a web server is organized and stored in a particular job posting record.);

Generating a plurality of capability profiles, wherein each capability profile includes attributes of a job applicant (col. 5, lines 49-67, Kurzius et al. teach that in operation of the system, the web server receives candidate qualification data in the form of a candidate profile from a job candidate.);

Storing the capabilities profiles as a data record in memory accessible by the human resources server (col. 5, lines 49-67, Kurzius et al. teach the candidate qualification data is communicated to the database server for processing, indexing and storage.);

Kurzius et al. fail to teach:

Repetitively and automatically matching the needs profiles and capability profiles to identify matched profiles, wherein a match comprises a set of profiles judged to be substantially compatible based upon correspondence of the attributes specified therein; and

Notifying a first user associated with one of the needs profiles and a second user associated with one of the capability profiles of the match, wherein the notifying comprises providing a degree of compatibility for the match to the first user and a degree of compatibility for the match to the second user.

Shapiro et al. teaches notifying a first user associated with a needs profile and a second user associated with one of the capability profiles of the match, wherein the notification provides a degree of compatibility for each user (Shapiro col. 13 line 66 to col. 14 line 63, col. 16 line 57 to col. 17 line 25, col. 18 lines 24-63, and col. 21 lines 45-67). The Shapiro system determines bilateral matching

based on the requirements of both persons having needs and persons having capabilities. The users are then notified of degrees of compatibilities, based on their requirements, on a list where the most compatible is listed first. The advantage of determining a pair of scores, as opposed to a unilateral matching, is that both parties' requirements are satisfied resulting in a better and more successful match. It would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, to combine the bilateral evaluation (pair of scores) of matching feature from the Shapiro et al. system to the Kurzus et al. system, both systems having the capabilities to find best matches for profiles, in order to satisfy both parties' requirements and to generate better matches, which is a goal of Shapiro et al. (Shapiro col. 1 lines 31-41 and col. 7 lines 38-44)

Claim 23 further recites limitations "repetitively and automatically matching needs profiles and capability profiles" already addressed by the rejection of claim 1; therefore the same rejection applies to this claim.

As per claim 25, Shapiro et al. teaches the method of claim 23, wherein the act of notifying comprising presenting a selected subset of attributes from the matched profile to users associated with the matched profile (see column 18 lines 24-47; where a closeness-to-fit analyzer matches a needs profile to a capability profile based on a subset of attributes and communicates the results to both users.). The advantage of notifying both users of the closeness-to-fit results is that it allows both users to verify that they have entered the appropriate requirements and verify the results of the closeness-to-fit provided the best possible matches. It would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, for

one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the feature of notifying the users of a list of compatible matches in order for the users to verify that the best possible matches determined, which is a goal of Shapiro et al. (Shapiro: col. 1 lines 31-41 and col. 7 lines 38-44).

As per claim 26, Kurzius et al. teach:

The method of claim 25 further comprising:

Responding to the notification of an indication of further interest in identified match (Kurzius et al. col. 4 lines 5-40; where a response to receiving notification can be done in many ways, including email.); and

Generating a detailed notification message to the users associated with the matched profiles in response to receiving messages from both users associated with a particular matched profile (Kurzius et al. col. 4 lines 5-40; where users have the ability to communicate and send notifications to each other. An employer may indicate interest in a candidate profile and transmit such interest for receipt by the web engine, indicating on the candidate's profile of detailed employer notification.).

As per claim 27, Kurzius et al. teach:

The method of claim 23 wherein the act of generating a capability profile comprises including attributes within the capability profile that describe the associated user's desire to apply particular skills in a future employment (Kurzius et al.: col. 16, lines 50-57, Kurzius et al. teach candidates can indicate career goals, desired benefits and other comments directed

toward the candidate's background or toward the candidate's desired employment opportunity.).

As per claim 28, Kurzus et al. teach:

A signal-bearing medium tangibly embodying a program of machine-readable instructions executable by a digital processing apparatus to perform a method for job applicants with hiring agents, the method comprising:

Generating a plurality of needs profiles, wherein each needs profile comprises attributes about a need associated with a particular hiring agent (col. 7, lines 8-25, Kurzus et al. teach the job posting database is composed of a plurality of job posting records that are generated from job posting submissions received from the web server. The job posting review template is a template including fields used to display job criteria for a particular job posting record that is accessed for review.);

Storing the needs profiles as a data record (col. 7, lines 8-25, Kurzus et al. teach a job posting submission generated by an employer using a web server is organized and stored in a particular job posting record.);

Generating a plurality of capability profiles, wherein each capability profile attributes of a job applicant (col. 5, lines 49-67, Kurzus et al. teach that in operation of the system, the web server receives candidate qualification data in the form of a candidate profile from a job candidate.);

Storing the capabilities profiles as a data record (col. 5, lines 49-67, Kurzus et al. teach the candidate qualification data is communicated to the database server for processing, indexing and storage.);

Kurzus fails to teach:

Repetitively and automatically matching the needs profiles and capability profiles to identify matched profiles, wherein a match comprises a set of profiles judged to be substantially compatible based upon correspondence of the attributes specified therein.

Claim 28 recites limitation "repetitively and automatically matching the needs profiles and capability profiles" already addressed by the rejection of claim 1; therefore the same rejection applies to this claim.

As per claim 29, Kurzus et al. teach:

The method of claim 21, wherein the users comprise job applicants or supplier agents and hiring agents or employers, wherein the profiles comprise profiles associated with the job applicants or supplier agents and profiles associated with the hiring agents or employers (col. 7, lines 8-25, Kurzus et al.; where the users and profiles can be job applicants, supplier agents, hiring agents, or employers.); and

Kurzus et al. fails to teach:

wherein attributes in the restricted sections of the profiles associated with the applicants or supplier agents comprises attributes associated with the applicants and the restricted section of the profiles associated with the hiring agents or employers comprises attributes associated with the employers.

Claim 29 recites the limitation of restricting data already addressed by the rejection of claim 15; therefore the same rejection applies to this claim.

As per claim 30, Kurzus et al. fails to teach:

degrees of compatibility for the first and second users differ in value.

Claim 29 recites limitations already addressed by the rejections of claims 1, 3, 23, and 25; therefore the same rejections apply to this claim.

As per claim 31, Kurzius et al. fails to teach:

degrees of compatibility each comprise a score for a set of matching components.

Claim 30 recites limitations already addressed by the rejections of claims 1, 3, 23, and 25; therefore the same rejections apply to this claim.

As per claim 32, Kurzius et al. teach:

The method of claim 31, wherein the first user comprises a particular one of the hiring agents and the second user comprises a particular one of the job applicants and wherein the set of matching components comprise components representative of skills and education, location and compensation (Kurzius et al.: col. 7 lines 8-25 and figures 14a, 14b and 15; where the first user can be a hiring agent and the second user can be a job applicant. The attributes set for matching are displayed in figures 14a, 14b, and 15. Data fields include location information, education information, employment information, skills information, and previous salary compensation information.).

### ***Conclusion***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following are pertinent to the current invention, though not relied upon:

Walker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5884270) teach a system for facilitating employment searches using anonymous communications includes a plurality of party terminals, a plurality of requestor terminals, and a central controller.

McGovern et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6370510) teach a method and apparatus for providing an interactive computer-driven employment recruiting service. The method and apparatus enables an employer to advertise available positions on the Internet, directly receive resumes from prospective candidates, and efficiently organize and screen the received resumes.

DeFoor (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0042000) teaches a method of matching job candidates with jobs in a specific city or region includes the steps of creating an accessible database, such as an Internet web site, which is specifically representative of a city or region, and a particular career field.

Puram et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6289340) teaches an apparatus, system and method selects a candidate from a pool of candidates to fill a position based on the skills held by the candidate, the skills desired for the position and the priority of the skills for the position.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kalyan K. Deshpande whose telephone number is (571) 272-5880. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*Kathy Keltner*  
kkd

*Susanna Diaz*  
SUSANNA M. DIAZ  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

*Att 3623*